



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,834	12/04/2003	Ulrich Bonne	H0004834(1100.1205101)	7422

128 7590 05/09/2006

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

DOUGLAS, KATHERINE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/727,834	Applicant(s) BONNE ET AL.	
	Examiner Katherine L. Douglas	Art Unit 1743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12,38 and 40-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12,38 and 40-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment filed on 6 March 2006 has been acknowledged. **Claims 1, 3-12, 38, and 40-50** are pending.

Response to Amendment

Rejection of **claims 1-9 and 38-46** as being anticipated by Brandon (GB 2208707A) has been *modified* in light of applicant's amendments.

Rejection of **claims 10-12 and 47-50** as being unpatentable over Brandon in view of Chandler (USPN 6,592,822) has been *modified* in light of applicant's amendments.

Objection to claims 38-50 as being substantial duplicates of claims 1-12 has been *withdrawn* in light of applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. **Claims 1 and 3-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brandon (GB 2208707A).

Brandon discloses an invention for the "detection of gaseous compounds" [page 1, paragraph 1]. This invention comprises "a gas absorbing cell having a chamber for liquid reagent separated from a region containing sample gas by a gas permeable membrane, the chamber having an inlet port for connection to a supply of liquid reagent

and an outlet port connected to the sensing apparatus for detecting a change in the liquid reagent due to the presence of the gas to be detected. . . . The analyser according to the invention enables a sample of a gaseous compound from, for example, ambient air to be collected by diffusion through the gas permeable membrane into the liquid reagent in the chamber, which may be stationary or moving. . . . In a preferred embodiment the sensing apparatus is an optical sensor, preferably a photometer. The output from the photometer may be processed electronically to provide an indicated value of the ambient gas concentration. The electronic circuitry may be constructed so as to provide an alarm signal" [pages 1-3]. Brandon discloses that the optical cell "may be mounted on the same body 40 of the gas absorbing cell 15 as indicated at 60 in Fig. 4" [page 8, paragraph 1]. Brandon also notes that "A second embodiment of the invention allows for "an optical cell comprising a body with a transverse bore closed at its ends by windows, an inlet connected to the bore adjacent one of its ends and an outlet connected to the bore adjacent the other of its ends, the inlet being connected to a source of fluid whereby fluid passes from the inlet to the outlet through the bore, a light source mounted outside one window and a photo detector being mounted outside the other window so that the photo detector detects light from the light source passing through the liquid in the bore" [page 3]. A third embodiment describes a container of liquid with a "pulsed valve" [page 3] that is connected to the output of the enclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1743

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 10-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon in view of Chandler (USPN 6,592,822).

Brandon does not specifically teach using multiple laser light sources that have different wavelengths or the use of a flow sensor. However, Chandler discloses “the instant invention provides a multi-analyte diagnostic system for use with a computer. The diagnostic system, for example, includes a flow analyzer including, a substantially co-planar optical assembly having at least one light source and at least one optical detector” [column 7, lines 15-19]. He goes on to further describe the light sources, saying “the plurality of light sources, optionally, include two light sources. Each light source, optionally, emits respective two distinct wavelengths of light” [column 7, lines 49-51]. Therefore, considering the teachings of Brandon in view of the teachings of Chandler, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the multiple light sources, using lasers of different wavelengths, as well as including a flow sensor for the purposes of expanding the range of possible analytes and, as indicated by Chandler, “it is desirable to minimize the testing time to increase the number of tests that can be performed over a predetermined time interval” [column 2, lines 64-67].

5. **Claims 38 and 40-46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon in view of Chun et al. (USPN 6,727,099).

Brandon does not specifically disclose a tubular permeable membrane enclosure, however, it is well known in the art that permeable membrane enclosures are often tubular in shape. Chun et al. disclose an analyzer that, as seen in figure 1, is a tubular permeable membrane. It would have been obvious to modify the analyzer of Brandon to use a tubular permeable membrane for the purpose of making the device more cheaply, or using a specific geometry to make calculations simpler.

6. **Claims 47-50** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon in view of Chun et al. further in view of Chandler. Brandon as modified by Chun et al. does not specifically teach using multiple laser light sources that have different wavelengths or the use of a flow sensor.

The teachings of Brandon ^{and Chun} are above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the multiple light sources, using lasers of different wavelengths, as well as including a flow sensor for the purposes of expanding the range of possible analytes and, as indicated by Chandler, "it is desirable to minimize the testing time to increase the number of tests that can be performed over a predetermined time interval" [column 2, lines 64-67].

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 6 March 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The sensor of Brandon can be in the same body as the gas absorbing cell, as stated on page 8 on lines 2-4.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 38 and 40-50** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katherine L. Douglas whose telephone number is 571-272-1207. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 am - 4:30 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1743

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

kld


Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700